REMARKS

Claims 12-31 remain in this application.

The examiner's allowance of claims 15-20 and 24-28 is gratefully acknowledged.

The examiner rejected claims 12-14, 21-23 and 29-31 as anticipated by Dombek et al.

For rejections under 35 USC 102, even though the structure of Dombek et al. is not a valve, if the examiner can read every element of structure which is recited in the claims on an element in Dombek et al., his rejection under 35 USC 102 is a valid rejection.

However, it is pointed out that the examiner's reading of the device of Dombek et al. is not appropriate. There are limitations recited in claim 12 which are not found in Dombek et al.

Claim 12 recites a first connection and a second connection. However, Dombek et al. has only one connection which he reeites as inlet/outlet 44. The examiner has read the portion connected to cap 46 as the first connection of Dombek et al., and the connection 82 as the second connection. Applicant firmly believes that the structure disclosed by Dombek et al. at 46 is not a connection which is **connectable to a low-pressure region**. The area around 46 of Dombek et al. is completely sealed, and **the seals make sure that this area is not connected to anything**. Thus, the examiner's reading of the first connection cannot be correct. Element 48 of Dombek et al. is a cap which closes the end 48 of chamber 52. The examiner's reading of a first connection in Dombek et al. is simply not warranted by the teachings of Dombek et al.

The examiner also indicates that element 70 of Dombek et al. is a closing element. Dombek et al. indicates that 80 is a seal between pump pistons 54 and 56, so element 70, in

cooperation with seal 80, does close the axial bore 60. However, the examiner is stretching the reference by calling element 70 a **valve** closing element, since element 70 does not open and close anything as would be normal and accepted for a valve closing element.

And it is pointed out that claim 12 has been revised so as to specifically recite that the closing element is operable for alternatively opening and closing the through opening. These alternative functions are clearly not present in Dombek et al. The only function which element 70 of Dombek et al. accomplishes is, with the aid of seals 80, sealing between pistons 54 and 56.

Further, the examiner has read element 49 of Dombek et al. as a pressure relief device, but clearly it is not. Element 49 of Dombek et al. is the manually operated plunger for the pump of Dombek et al. As such, in cooperation with the seals 80, it must always maintain a seal so that chamber 52 remains a closed chamber. If it does not do this the pump of Dombek et al. would not work, it would not pump anything. Element 49 does not open or close any openings, and it does not relieve any pressure.

Element 49 does not provide communication from the second connection to the first connection, and it does not relieve pressure in the return as now recited in both of claims 12 and 31. The structure as disclosed by Dombek et al. simply does not teach a connection anywhere near 46.

In fact, it is clearly stated by the disclosure of Dombek et al. that element 49 is manually operated to increase the pressure. It is clear from the disclosure of Dombek et al. that it never relieves the pressure.

Moreover, Dombek et al. does not disclose a pressure holding valve such as recited in the claims of this application. A valve mechanism is a mechanism which opens and closes, and the structure of Dombek et al. does not do this. Dombek et al. is in fact a manually actuated pump; it does not open and close anything as a valve is well understood to do.

Even though, as noted above, the examiner's reading of Dombek et al. is inappropriate since Dombek et al. does not read on the structure as recited in claim 12, claim 12 has nevertheless again been amended to more clearly recite that the closing element is a means "for alternatively opening and closing the through opening". This gives the claim a definite recitation that the closing element has a further function which the structure of Dombek et al. clearly does not have.

For the above reasons, entry of the amendment and allowance of the claims are courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald E. Greigg
Registration No. 31,517
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 02119

GREIGG & GREIGG, P.L.L.C.
1423 Powhatan Street, Suite One
Alexandria, VA 22314

Tel. (703) 838-5500
Fax. (703) 838-5554

REG/SLS/ncr

J:\Bosch\R305588\Reply to 5-22-09 OA.wpd